

REMARKS

By this amendment, claims 1, 2, 7, and 8 are amended, claims 3, 5, 6, and 10 are canceled, and claim 12 is added. The amendments are made to even more clearly recite the claimed invention and do not add new matter and are fully supported by the specification. Reconsideration of the rejected claims in view of the above amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Allowable Subject Matter

Applicants thank the Examiner for indicating that claim 1 would be allowable if allowable if it is amended to remove claim language that is objected to under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

Objections to the Specification

The Office Action objects to the specification, alleging that amendments made to the specification are new matter. Without agreeing with or acquiescing to the rejection, Applicants note that the specification has been amended to remove the alleged new matter, i.e., the generic terminology on pages 6-8 of the specification, which was added to the specification in the Office Action Response dated October 23, 2006. In the previous Office Action, Applicants also made amendments to pages 10-18 of the specification, including the phrase “sold under the trademark” before trademark names in recognition of the proprietary nature of these marks. These amendments remain in the specification, as they do not add new matter and comply with the provisions set forth in MPEP § 608.01(v). Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the objections be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph

The Office Action rejects claims 3, 6, and 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Without agreeing with or acquiescing to the rejection, Applicants note that claims 3, 6, and 10 have been canceled. Applicants respectfully request that the rejections be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph

The Office Action rejects claims 1-11, alleging that the claims are indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter. Specifically, the Examiner asserts that the terms “high cross linkage,” “high porous,” “styrene type,” and “high porosity” in claims 1, 2, and 3. Without agreeing with or acquiescing to the rejection, Applicants note that these claims have been amended to remove the terms “high” and “type.”

The Office Action also rejects claims 5 and 6, alleging that the terms “gel or porous type,” “gel type,” and “porous type” are indefinite. Without agreeing with or acquiescing to the rejection, Applicants note that the claims 5 and 6 have been canceled.


The Office Action also rejects claim 7, alleging that the phrase “such as” is unclear. Without agreeing with or acquiescing to the rejection, Applicants note that the claim has been amended to remove the allegedly objectionable language. A new dependent claim is added to recite the acid choices previously recited in claim 7.

Finally, the Office Action rejects claims 7 and 8, alleging that the phrase “water is in the range of pH...” is unclear. Without agreeing with or acquiescing to the rejection, Applicants note that the claims have been amended. Applicants respectfully request that the rejections be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants submit that all of the claims are patentably distinct from the prior art of record and are in condition for allowance. The Examiner is respectfully requested to pass the above application to issue. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below, if needed. Please charge any deficiencies in fees and credit any overpayment of fees to Deposit Account No. 19-0089.

Respectfully submitted,
KANG et al.


Bruce Bernstein
Reg. No. 29,027 42,920

April 9, 2007
Greenblum & Bernstein, P.L.C.
1950 Roland Clarke Place
Reston, Virginia 20191
Telephone: 703-716-1191
Facsimile: 703-716-1180